

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

Noah Schroeder,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT - WI
FILED

Plaintiff,

2011 FEB 23 A 11:23

v.

case no. 15 - cv - 1158

Terry Sawall, et al.,

Defendants,

PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

Comes now, plaintiff, Noah Schroeder, pro se, to hereby move this court, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 for an order denying summary judgement in this lawsuit.

The grounds for this motion are set forth in the accompanying Plaintiff's brief, responses to Defendant's declarations and Defendants proposed findings.

Plaintiff is including an order from a writ of Mandamus in Circuit court, to be introduced as evidence ex. U. Plaintiff is using this evidence to prove he did not make the phone calls in question that Captain Terry Sawall stated that ~~he~~ made.

Plaintiff is also submitting confidential information summary and introduces it as Ex. V. This evidence will be used to show a general disregard that Sawall has had in the past when dealing with confidential informants. See CI # 1 Tention.

Plaintiff asserts interrogatory questions and responses as references to refute declarations by defendants.

Plaintiff is going to show why he believes summary judgement should be denied. There are many discrepancies with each defendant as each defendant was blatantly incompetent and show cause for a deliberate indifference claims. There are several instances where defendants contradict other defendant and instances when defendants contradict themselves.

Plaintiff is pointing out to the court that defendants have failed to provide discovery items;

a.) Plaintiff requested specific video footage from 6-16-15 sector 1 through sector 7 from 5:20 p.m. - 6:10 p.m. (see plaintiff's third request for documents.) This evidence is vital to show how defendants Kropp and Dobberstein responded to the assault. Plaintiff did have a chance to view a video that only showed the first responders to the emergency and not the rec. field.

b.) Plaintiff requested DAI investigation 2015-18 in it's entirety. (see plaintiffs third request for documents) this evidence is vital for plaintiff's case to be able to produce indisputable proof that the 8th amendment claim is valid.

c.) Plaintiff requested 23 color photographs from the scene of the incident and the wounds the plaintiff suffered from the attack. No photographs at all have been produced to date. The photographs are vital to prove that plaintiff's 8th amendment claim is valid.

Plaintiff reasserts his claim to 8th amendment relief.
Each defendant was deliberately indifferent in their own way.
Plaintiff made pleas that his safety was in jeopardy and each
defendant failed to respond reasonably to protect the plaintiff.
FARMER V. BRENNAN, 511 u.s. 825 (1994)

Dated this 20th day of February 2017.

Respectfully submitted,



Noah Schroeder # 340622
Wisconsin Resource Center
Post Office Box 220
Winnebago WI 54985 - 0220

LA
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

NOAH SCHROEDER #340622
WISCONSIN RESOURCE CENTER
POST OFFICE BOX 220
WINNEBAGO WI, 54985 - 0220

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT-WI
FILED

2017 FEB 23 A 11:23

February 20, 2017

re: Noah Schroeder v. Terry Sawall et. al.,
Eastern District Case no. 15-cv-1158

Dear Clerk,

Enclosed please find a copy of the following documents which
were filed on today's date on behalf of Plaintiff, Noah Schroeder

- plaintiff's response to summary judgment
- responses to summarized declarations for defendants Edward Wall, Michael Meisner, Scott Eckstein, Steven Schueler, Terry Sawall, Michelle Smith, Ashley Freitag, Tom Dobberstein, Brian Kropp.
- Summarized interrogatory responses for all above named defendants with the exception of Edward Wall.
- plaintiff's brief in support to deny summary judgment
- legal arguments with supplemental proposed findings of fact; and
- certificate of service

Respectfully submitted,



Noah Schroeder